

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Status of Claims:

Claims 1-6 and 8-15 remain pending. By way of the present reply, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 8 and 14. Claim 9 has also been amended to address a typographical error. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier. Thus, claims 1-6 and 8-15 remain pending in the application.

Examiner's Response to Arguments:

The Office Action in Item 1 indicates that it is not clear if the retranslation part receives new source language information and target language information from the user or previously inputted source language information and target language information. Independent claims 1, 8 and 14 have been amended to clarify this issue. The invention as claimed allows both cases to occur. Specifically, the claims have been amended to recite "at least one language information input column to be inputted source language information and/or target language information by the user for retranslation."

Item 1 of the Office Action also requests an explanation of why the retranslation instruction part is needed. When a retranslation is required, the present invention does not have to go back pages to access the translation server or input again the location information of an object document, source language information, and the target language information. By utilizing the invention as claimed, the number of operations of a user is reduced and the communication cost is also reduced.

We take as an example Spanish and Portuguese, which resemble each other in their appearance. These two languages may be mistaken for the other. When a user selects wrong

source language information, he or she needs to re-input ONLY the source language information into the retranslation instruction part column to obtain a retranslation.

Another example involves translating a Japanese phrase or sentence into English and Korean, to show to business partners from the U.S. and Korea. In this case, we need only input the target language information into the retranslation instruction part column to execute the retranslation of the Japanese phrase or sentence.

Thus, the source language information or the target language information that is input into the retranslation instruction part column is the information used for retranslation. Further, as is shown in the invention as claimed, the user can freely select this information.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103:

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 8, 9, 11, 12 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's admitted prior art (Background of the Invention section) in view of Fushimoto (US 5742505).

Independent claim 1 has been amended to recite “retranslation instruction part causing the terminal to display (1) at least one language information input column to be inputted source language information and/or target language information, for retranslation, (2) the location information, previously inputted by a user of the terminal, representing the location of the object document to be translated, and (3) a retranslation instruction input part.” The Office Action indicates in Item 4 that Fushimoto teaches this feature in figure 7, 9 and 10, except for the display of the location information. The Office Action further contents that this is taught by the Applicant's admitted prior art in the specification, pages 2-3, and figure 1. However, none of the source language information, the target language information or the location information are taught in either of the references to be displayed. Figure 10 in Fushimoto is merely a chart showing the result of a search according to the translation process of figure 9 (see column 3, lines 1-2). This chart, other than the underlined words in the column 103, is not disclosed in Fushimoto as being displayed to the user (see column 8, lines 12-13). Although the background and summary section in the specification discloses the user designating the uniform resource locator (URL) for representing the location of the

document to be translated in a browser (see page 2, lines 11-18), this section does not disclose a retranslation instruction part causing the terminal to display the location information, previously inputted by a user of the terminal, representing the location of the object document to be translated, as claimed in independent claims 1, 8 and 14.

To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. MPEP § 2143.03 (quoting *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974)). Because the prior art relied upon does not teach nor suggest retranslation instruction part causing the terminal to display at least one language information input column to be inputted source language information and/or target language information for translation, the location information, previously inputted by a user of the terminal, representing the location of the object document to be translated, and a retranslation instruction input part, as claimed in independent claims 1, 8 and 14, *prima facie* obvious has not been established.

Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's admitted prior art in view of Fushimoto of dependent claims 1, 8 and 14 be withdrawn.

If an independent claim is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) then any claim depending therefrom is nonobvious. *Id.* (quoting *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988)). Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's admitted prior art in view of Fushimoto of dependent claims 2, 4 and 5; and 9, 11 and 12 be withdrawn from their dependence on independent claims 1 and 8, respectively.

Claims 3 and 6; 10 and 13; and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's admitted prior art (Background of the Invention section) in view of Fushimoto (US 5742505), as applied to claims 1, 8 and 14, respectively, and further in view of Murata et al. (US 5987402).

The Office Action does not indicate that Murata provides the missing limitation discussed above. Murata does not disclose a retranslation instruction part as claimed in independent claims 1, 8 and 14 (see columns 9-11 and figures 7 and 8). Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Applicant's admitted prior art in view of Fushimoto, as applied to claims 1, 8 and 14, respectively, and further in view of Murata of dependent claims 3 and 6; 10 and 13; and 15 be withdrawn from their dependence on independent claims 1, 8 and 14, respectively.

Conclusion:

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.


The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check or credit card payment form being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date November 16, 2007

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 945-6014
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

By  (Reg. 59597)
for George C. Beck
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 38,072